

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Fig. 1 has been amended to include “PRIOR ART”, as attached, in response to the Examiner’s objection to this drawing. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawing is solicited.

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 20 are pending in this application. In response to the Office Action dated November 23, 2005, a new abstract and drawing sheet containing a correction to Fig. 1 have been submitted. Care has been taken to avoid addition of new matter. Claims 1 through 3, 6 through 13 and 16 through 20 stand rejected; claims 4, 5, 14 and 15 stand under objection but are allowable subject to presentation appropriately independent of rejected parent claims. Favorable reconsideration of the application in light of the following comments is respectfully solicited.

Objection has made to the drawings for the reason that Fig. 1 has not been labeled "Prior Art." In response a drawing sheet is submitted herewith of Fig. 1 containing the required label.

Objection has been made to the abstract for being too lengthy. In response, a new abstract has been submitted that meets the length requirement stated in the Office Action. No new matter has been presented. Both objections thus have been overcome; withdrawal thereof is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1 through 3, 6 through 13 and 16 through 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 6,133,986 (Johnson) and as being anticipated by U.S. published patent application 2003/0123040 (Almogy). Inasmuch as the filing date of the present application is April 1, 2003 (with a priority date of April 10, 2003), and the publication date of Almogy is July 3, 2003, it is assumed that the intended statutory basis for reliance upon the Almogy publication is 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). The rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claims 1 and 11 are the only independent claims. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, the following:

a sub-scanning mechanism for intermittently moving said irradiation region group relative to a photosensitive material in a sub-scanning direction orthogonal to said main scanning direction *by a distance shorter than a width of said irradiation region group* in said sub-scanning direction . . . (emphasis supplied).

Claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, the following:

moving said irradiation region group relative to a photosensitive material in a sub-scanning direction orthogonal to said main scanning direction *by a distance shorter than a width of said irradiation region group* in said sub-scanning direction . . . (emphasis supplied).

Neither Johnson nor Almogy discloses the travel distance in the sub-scanning direction to be shorter than a width of the irradiation region group in the sub-scanning direction. Claims 1 through 3, 6 through 13 and 16 through 20, therefore, are patentably distinguishable.

The claim requirement italicized above makes it possible to write a fine pattern at high speed. The allowable claims 4, 5, 14 and 15 represent a specific case of parent claims 1 and 11. In the parent claims, the sub-scanning mechanism moves the irradiation region group by a distance shorter than a width of the irradiation region group in the sub-scanning direction intermittently. The specific (or theoretically preferable) travel distance of the irradiation region group is $B X \cos \theta$ of claim 5 and this can be slightly changed to eliminate a line (i.e., linear pattern) between main scannings which is caused by a change of sensitive of the photoresist (see, lines 3 to 13 on page 15). Of course the travel distance can be more reduced if a width of the linear pattern between main scannings is wide.

Moreover, as described in lines 13 to 16 on page 15, if it is not necessary to use all of the irradiation region group, the travel distance can be longer than that of claim 5 and shorter than the width of the irradiation group to perform more speedy pattern writing. Since neither Johnson

nor Almogy disclose such sub-scanning travel distance, there is no anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application are respectfully solicited. To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Gene Z. Rubinson
Registration No. 33,351

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 GZR:lnm
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: February 16, 2006

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**

WDC99 1196717-1.065326.0035